THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRi J. VENGAL RAO): (a) Information, to the extent available, will be collected and laid on tbe Table of the Rajya Sabha.

(b) The details of prices fixed in •respect of drugs involved in the Supreme Court case are quite voluminous. Th© time and efforts required for collection of these details would be incommensurate with the results likey to be achieved.

**Representations against the fixed prices**

3002. SHRI DHULESHWAR MEENA: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 2041 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 28th November, 1988 and state;

(a) how many representations against the prices of bulk drugs and formulations fixed in 198? and 193Sl were received;

(b) how many of these representations have been processed and decided so far and what institutional arrangements have been evolved to dispose of such representations;

(c) what is the average time taken in disposing of the representations; and

(d) what are the names of bulk drugs and formulations for which prices were revised after representations and the names of those bulk drugs and formulations for which representations were rejected without any revision in prices?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRl J. VENGAL RAO): (a) to (d) As the prices of a large number of bulk drugs and formulations were fixed during the years 1987 and 1988, representations/review petitions have been received from many companies in respect of various price fixations. All efforts are made t° dispose of the pending cases (review petitions) as quickly as possible.

**Multivitamin case**

3003. SHRI DHULESHWAR MEENA; Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 2068 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 28th November, 1988 and state;

(a) whether it is a fact that his Ministry has filed an appeal in a bench of the Bombay High Court against the judgement of a single judge in respect of multivitamin cases;

(b) if so, when this appeal was filed and what is its status now;

(c) whether it is a fact that certain parties have withdrawn their cases at the instance of his Ministry;

(d) whether it is a fact that M/s. Pfizer gave an undertaking to his Ministry; if so, what are the contents of the undertaking;

(e) whether it is also a fact that certain companies sold vitamin formulations at prices even higher than those to which they were entitled even with 100 per cent MAPE adjustment;

(f) whether his Ministry has worked out unintended benefit; and

(g) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRl J. VENGAL RAO): (a) to (d) Government had Sled an appeal in the year 1987 against the Judgement of the Bombay" High Court dated 23-3-87 in the case of M/s. Sandoz (India) Ltd. and dated 6-4-87 in the case of M/s. Pfizer Ltd. and Mjs. Abbott Labs. (India) Ltd. The appeal was allowed by the High Court in the case of M/s. Sandoz (India) Ltd., on 23-9-1987 and the judgement dated 23-3-87 was quashed and set aside. In other two cases, the concerned companies have subsequently withdrawn the writ petitions filed by them. M/s. Pfizer had also expressed their willingness to implement the revised prices

$t_0$ be fixed under DPCO, 1987 with 100 per cent MAPE.

(e) to (g) The companies referred -to above had been charging their own prices $i_n$ respect Of concerned formu-: at ons due to the stay granted by the Bombay High Court.

Committee on tfte role of public sector

3004. DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY; Will the Minister of INDUS-:TiY be pleased to refer to t'ne answer to Starred Question 63 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 27th February, 1989 and state:

a) when the sub-committee was appointed;

(b) who $wsr_e$ the members of the sub-committee and what were the terms of reference of the Committee;

(c) whether the Committee made any recommendations in respect to stock and sale of imported drugs by public sector;

'd) if $_s$o, what are the details thereof;

(e) what are $th_e$ points of difference between the recommendations of the sub-committee and Chawda Committee on the role of public sector;

(f) whether his Ministry accepted the recommendation^ of the subcommittee;

(g) if so, when and what are the $detail_s$ thereof;

(h) what are the details of recommendations of Chawda Committee accepted by his Ministry regarding the role of public sector;

(i) whether his Ministry appointed anj-other Committee on the role of IDPL; and

(j) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO): (a) (b: and (e) to (h) A sub-cor-tmittee of the Consultative Committee of the then Minister of Petroleum, Chemicals and Fertilizers called the Chawda Committee was appointed on 2-1-1978 with the following composit'on: —

1. Shri K. S. Chavda, M.P.— Convenor.

2. Shri N. Anandan, M. P.— Member.

3. Shri Prem Manohar, M. P.— Member.

The Sub-Committee was required to go into the facts concerning the prices of imported bulk drugs reported to be higher than the indigenous price, in the context, further of canalised import prices being reportedly higher than the prices at which the actual s were said to be importing them. In brief, the recommendations made by the Sub-Committee are as under: —

(i) Sale of canalised bulk drugs should be exempted from Central Sales Tax;

(ii) Similarly, all State Governments should be required to exempt =uch sales from the States Sales Tax;

(iii) The CCI&E's formula for fixing prices of canal'sed bulk drugs should be reviewed immediately on the basis of actual expenditure incurred by the canalising/distributing agency, with a view to reducing such costs and pass the resultant benefit to the consumer. The Sub-Committee also made several other recommendations regarding prices of canalised bulk drugs. The recommendations' of the Committee were, however, informal and advisory in nature.

IDPL does not distribute canalised bulk drugs any more.

*(c)* No, Sir.

(d) Does not arise.

(i) and (j) No other committee was appointed with reference to the issues connected with Chawda Committee .